



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/684,616	10/10/2000	Takashi Hashimoto	198427US2	2258

22850 7590 07/23/2003

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

NGUYEN, JIMMY H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2673	13

DATE MAILED: 07/23/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/684,616	HASHIMOTO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jimmy H. Nguyen	2673	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 25 June 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

a) The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.

2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:

- (a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.

6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-11.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.

9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.

10. Other: _____

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of the same reasons as set forth in the last Office Action. Further, with respect to the rejection under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, to claims 1-8, 10 and 11, Applicants' argument that all column electrodes of an address electrode electrically connected in common is supported in the specification, page 2, lines 9-23, is persuasive, and Applicants' argument, "However ... there is no necessity for a sustain electrode to include 2t strip portions ... Action", page 3, lines 12-15, is however not persuasive because (1) the step of "applying a first voltage ... discharge cell" (see claim 1, last 4 lines) is disclosed corresponding to the AC plasma display panel comprising t strip portions of a scan electrode X and 2t strip portions of sustain electrode Y (see figs. 1 and 2, page 23, lines 7-13, and (2) there is no where in the disclosure to disclose "there is no necessary for a sustain electrode to include 2t strip portion if a scan electrode includes t strip portions", as argued by Applicants. With respect to the rejection under 35 USC 103(a) to claims 1, 2, 5-8, 10 and 11, Applicants' argue that Ryan et al. do not indicate electrode electrically connected in common as claimed in claim 1, pages 3-4, examiner disagrees because, as discussed in the last Office Action, Ryan clearly teaches all strip portions (36) of an address electrode connected in common to an output terminal (-P1, -P2 or -P3) of the driving unit (see fig. 1, col. 1, lines 57-59). With respect to the rejection under 35 USC 103(a) to claim 9, Applicants' argue claim 9 expressly reciting that the barrier ribs separate the non-discharge cells from the discharge cells at least along a direction intersecting with the display line, examiner disagrees because Applicants ignore "or said non-discharge cells", see line 20 of claim 9. In other words, the discussed feature may be read as "a plurality of barrier ribs separating said non-discharge cells from said non-discharge cells at least along a direction intersecting with said display line", and is clearly shown in fig. 10 of AAPA. For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.



BIPIN SHALWALA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600